

CITY-COUNTY COMMON

County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE 68508

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

COMMON AGENDA MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2005 COUNTY/CITY BUILDING CONFERENCE ROOM 113 8:30 a.m.

I MINUTES:

- A. Approving Minutes of the May 2, 2005 Common Meeting

II PRESENTATIONS:

- A. RUTS/Joint Public Agency - Roger Figard/Don Thomas/City&County Attorney's Offices - (30 Min)
- B. Briefing on the Comp Plan Annual Review & the Comp Plan LRTP - Planning (30 Min)
- C. Cardwell Branch Update & Other Floodplain Mapping Activities - PW/NRD/Dan Rus - USGS (30 Min)
- D. Keno Interlocal Update - K. Boesch-Human Services - (15 Min)

III NEW BUSINESS

IV OLD BUSINESS

V ADJOURNMENT

CITY-COUNTY COMMON

County-City Building • 555 S. 10th Street • Lincoln, NE 68508

County Commissioners
(402) 441-7447

Mayor
(402) 441-7511

City Council
(402) 441-7515

COMMON MEETING MINUTES

Monday, June 6, 2005

8:30 a.m.

County/City Building - Room 113

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook (Arrived Late), Robin Eschliman, Dan Marvin, Annette McRoy, Patte Newman, Ken Svoboda; *COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT:* None

MAYOR SENG: In Attendance

COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Bernie Heier (Arrived Late), Larry Hudkins, Deb Schorr, Bob Workman; *COUNTY BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:* Ray Stevens

1. MINUTES

A. Approving Minutes from the May 2, 2005 Common Meeting

Ms. Patte Newman, Common Chair for 2005, called for a motion to approve the above-listed minutes. Larry Hudkins moved to approve the minutes as presented. Ken Svoboda seconded the motion which carried by unanimous consent of the Common members present.

THIS MEETING WAS SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS:

RUTS (RURAL TO URBAN TRANSITIONS FOR STREETS) PROGRAM

COMP PLAN ANNUAL REVIEW & THE COMP PLAN LRTP

CARDWELL BRANCH UPDATE & OTHER FLOODPLAIN MAPPING ACTIVITIES

KENO INTERLOCAL UPDATE

RUTS (RURAL TO URBAN TRANSITIONS FOR STREETS) PROGRAM: Roger Figard, City Engineer, began the presentation with an over-view of the legalities outlined within the document itself. Previously distributed was a draft of the Joint Public Agency document along with an Interlocal Agreement that explains the components of the RUTS program. We've given you data showing the revenue that might be produced through a one cent property tax; we've given you information that shows the revenue possibilities of a County-wide wheel tax. There may be a couple of questions which Joe Rupp (City Attorney's Office) and Kristy Mundt (County Attorney's Office) can explain to the Common members.

Mr. Figard stated that decisions needed to be made within the creation of the agency. Would the two governing bodies -City Council/County Board- need to make a decision in the document on what the funding source will be and how much - or would the two bodies want to delegate that authority to the respective Board Members who would be setting on the Joint Public Agency. Mr. Rupp and Ms. Mundt came forward to discuss those issues and possible options.

Ms. Newman noted that the Common members had received the break-down from the individual communities on Wheel Tax. The other question that was raised at the last Common meeting was information on a fuel tax and how much revenue that might bring in within the County. Mr. Figard answered that he did have the wheel tax figures, but did not have the fuel tax information.

Mr. Rupp and Ms. Mundt began their presentation. Mr. Rupp commented that they were there to explain the delegation of the taxing authority to the JPA or the option to have that authority remain with the two governmental bodies. He stated that from a practical standpoint, we do need to come up with what the extent of that authority might be. If the Agency is given the right to impose a wheel tax, this Board [The Common] would have to collectively do that. If we do a property tax, we need to have a limit set for the Joint Agency. If there is a limit for the Agency, then the Agency itself can determine how much of that they would use. We need to determine the amount of authority you will be giving to that Agency.

Ms. Newman asked Mr. Rupp to compare the JPA with other, existing, groups we might currently have. Mr. Rupp stated that this JPA would be a unique entity. The Joint Public Agency is something that is very new - and have only been noted in the State's Statutes for a couple of years now. There are probably only two others of which Mr. Rupp was aware, in the State of Nebraska.

Ms. Schorr commented that she thought this would be very similar to the RTSD - is there no comparison? Mr. Rupp stated that he was not really familiar with the RTSD, so could not make a comparison. Mr. Workman stated that the RTSD does request funds, but those funds are approved by the County Board. The RTSD, every year, requests funding and that request goes to the County Board and the County Board either approves that amount requested, or an amount less than that. Mr. Workman also stated that there was the Antelope Agreement with the Event Center, the AG Society and the Lancaster County Board. On that one, the bonds were approved by the County Board in the beginning and the funds are only distributed by the Agency, so there is no request for new funds.

Mr. Marvin commented that the bonding raises an issue. He asked if it were anticipated that the JPA would have bonding authority? Mr. Rupp answered that, yes - as it is currently written, the agreement allows bonding authority. Mr. Marvin stated that he was concerned about bonding. He noted that we're trying to create a pay-as-you-go system for the roads system. Bonding and borrowing on future revenue to build specific projects, while there may be a need for short-term financing to complete large projects over a one-year period instead over two or three, if we borrow all that future revenue, we would never get out of.... Put ourselves onto a pay-as-you-go system.

Mr. Rupp noted that one of the things the agreement states, as it is written now, is that before it can issue bonds, it must go, separately, before both the City Council and the County Board. The authority is there, but only after it has been brought before each body.

Mayor Seng commented that, knowing how the City and County have worked together, that that is probably how we would feel most comfortable...that is how it's been done down through the years. Everything has always gone back to the individual bodies....she suspected that that is the way this should be set up. Ms. Newman stated that she agreed.

Mr. Hudkins commented that that is what we've done with the Public Building Commission. We operate jointly, but when there is a major project, we go back singularly for a decision. He had the same concerns that Councilman Marvin had just expressed. What they had hoped to do was create a pay-as-you-go project - though, not saying that there may not be a special need sometime, at which point the issue would go back to both bodies. For now, what we should do is be very careful about not giving a third entity this bonding power, but create the mechanism in the vehicle to accumulate funds so that we can purchase this right-of-way before having to go back and condemn it afterwards. As "aware" as everyone is of the property tax, he felt this would probably be the most equitable vehicle in the short term to fund this. We are dealing with property acquisition issues and this will be an investment in our infrastructure. Mr. Hudkins felt this body should make the decision to at least fund this in this year's budget cycle.

Mr. Camp asked if Mr. Hudkins were discussing property tax or wheel tax. Mr. Hudkins indicated that he was referring to property tax, noting that wheel tax is very problematic with the rural area, because we do not have a wheel tax in rural Lancaster County at this time. He noted that with AG districts there may be only a few people in a household, but they may have five to seven vehicles. He agreed that there may be a formula under which a wheel tax could be applied equitably, but the proportion of people and the amount of usage of the roads would be heavily weighted against people that have to have vehicles for their business.

Mr. Camp noted that what he was hearing from people was a concern on the over-all tax climate. He wanted to make sure that we don't create another entity that then goes out and in some fashion just increases the tax load without some reins for control. Mr. Camp felt as this joint entity was created controls should be built in on its authority. He felt the wheel tax tied in well with the intent of this entity for acquiring road right-of-ways...and would encourage dialogue to address that so we could work on something that is mutually beneficial for both rural and urban constituents.

Ms. Schorr noted that this goes back to flexibility, if Mr. Camp is concerned about whether or not the authority to set the levy is from the two bodies individually or the new joint agency. It is difficult to see into the future, but knowing that we might need a balance of property and wheel tax, which one of those two methods would give us the most flexibility to "tweak" that on an annual or every two-three year basis? Mr. Hupp commented that if we're going to increase the wheel tax, that will go before the City Council to increase the City's wheel tax which will be extended over the entire County through this JPA.

The Joint Public Agency Agreement can be amended at any time. It will be a similar process of going before the two bodies. We can always extend or increase the amount of property tax if it is needed.

Mr. Workman commented that he was not in favor of bonding. He did not favor this Joint Agency making that major decision...he felt those decisions should come back to these two bodies. He added that he was not adverse to considering a wheel tax in the County. We have so much property tax now. The problem he saw with the wheel tax is that..if a County wheel tax were initiated, it would create 1.8 million dollars in revenue; but this is a Joint Agency...what and how would the City contribute their portion. If we expand wheel tax in the County designed just for the RUTS program, how would the City come up with their portion if not through property tax?

Mr. Marvin stated that his thoughts of a wheel tax in the County include a concern for sensitivity to the fact that there will be vehicles in the County that are not City vehicles. He felt there could be some sort of exemption for Ag vehicles. Tractors should pay a wheel tax because they've got wheels. But he thought this is a way to equalize between the City & County. It is a fair decision as well, because we have people who are

residents using City and County Roads and paying wheel taxes in the City, but not the County. We can work to try to equalize that. That is the aspect, in terms of the variability of the funds, and making adjustments with a property tax component as well as a wheel tax; that would be the variability adjustment. If we work to try to equalize the City & County wheel tax, then create the variable element to be the property tax...that would be a reasonable way to do it. The last point, if County residents are kicking in wheel tax dollars into RUTS and City residents aren't - is that fair? He hadn't thought through that component, but he did note that City residents are kicking in wheel tax dollars right now to build many of the roads that County residents are driving on within the current city limits.

Ms. Newman requested Mr. Figard to pass out the material on the break-down of wheel tax information. She noted that it does break-out farm vehicles for each of the satellite communities.

Mr. Camp agreed that farm vehicles need special consideration. He also noted that recreational vehicles are subject to wheel tax, and those owners may only take their vehicles out once or twice a year, but still pay. This may give us an opportunity to make the system more equitable. Mr. Camp also commented that where the County hasn't had a wheel tax, here we have an opportunity to pull things up to a posture of equity that may not have existed in the past. His third comment regarded the question of what the City would contribute. He felt this was a fair question. What we may need to do is ear-mark some of the current wheel tax that is collected on City residents to go into the RUTS funding...or into this Joint Agency funding, in some way. If we're talking about a property tax element, that would be heavily weighted against the City residents since they would be paying a much larger share of dollars than the County would. These are all things to be considered.

Mr. Camp did note that he wanted to be very careful to look at the over-all tax amount that is going to be imposed upon our citizens -City or County- because there is a fragility in the community of how much taxes we can continue to impose without good economic growth.

Mr. Svoboda stated that there is the one other option on which the City will be opening dialogue at some point and that is the fuel occupation tax. We could always designate a certain portion of that toward the RUTS program. Even though that's not specific to the City paying for it, the majority of the funds would be coming from City dwellers and we could designate a certain portion of that towards RUTS.

Discussion continued with Mr. Hudkins noting that an inequity exists because Lincoln, being an employment center, brings many people in from outlying area that are outside of both the City and the County. That is the reason the County favored the fuel tax. That would be equitable, sharing the tax with those benefitting. He noted that even though Ag vehicles do use a great deal of fuel, the cost can be used as deductible business expenses, so it would still offer an equitable solution. He thought it would be good to begin this Agency with property tax and then look into a fuel tax for future funding in lieu of a wheel tax. He noted that, though the County residents do use City streets without paying the wheel tax, they bring a great deal of money to the City coffers through the City's sales tax when they come to Lincoln to shop.

Ms. Newman asked what would happen when the two bodies disagree on the way we should go. Mr. Rupp didn't know. Mr. Hudkins commented that constituents have contacted him saying, if the wheel tax is extended at the current rate on the County residents, it would result in those County residents coming up with 1.8 million dollars worth of revenues. How would the City match that? County residents would feel they were bearing the majority of the burden for a project that is supposedly for the benefit of both.

Mr. Workman asked what the total revenue of the City was from the wheel tax on City residents? It was noted that the amount was probably about 9.4 million dollars. Mr. Figard commented that the one thing that needed to be closely focused upon is that the current wheel tax coming in is very specifically ear-marked as to where we need to spend it. Any changes we make in that should take into account the legislative changes that would be required to give us that flexibility.

Mr. Marvin stated that the impression he was getting was that people don't appreciate the 9 million dollars that Lincoln residents are paying to maintain the city roads, which includes snow removal and pothole repair. A great deal of this maintenance is on arterial roads that all citizens of the County and the City use. He felt there is a contribution in that element there - maybe not to the new JPA, but the contribution has been made and is continuing to be made from City residents to create roads that all people in the community can use.

Mr. Svoboda asked if there was a State mandated cap on wheel tax? No one was aware of such a cap. Ms. Newman pointed out that the wheel tax was supposed to be a temporary tax, though it had been implemented a long time ago.

Mr. Workman noted that he understood why the City couldn't "mess" with the 9.4 million. He did amend his earlier comment noting that the 1.8 million did include the villages, but the County's own revenue would be 1.4 million. He had calculated that the one cent tax in the City of Lincoln would be the total amount of 1.3 million. The reason he was saying City only now is because the County is right up against their property tax lid of thirty cents. What if the City were to implement a one cent property tax within the City limits which would raise 1.3 million and if the County would instigate some type of a wheel tax that would bring in an equal amount - another 1.3 or 1.4 million - that would be 2.6 million. RTSD brings in 3-4 million and that amount of money could be used to work with. 1.3 million isn't going to be enough, but the 2.6 million seems like a significant amount that could accumulate. That was Mr. Workman's proposal: [Recapping: One cent property tax in the City of Lincoln which would equal 1.3 million; Wheel tax in the County which would bring in another 1.3 million, after adjusting for tractors, etc. That would give us the 2.6 million per year].

Mr. Workman added that he was very much in favor of the fuel tax option, but we cannot do it until State Legislation is implemented, but he hoped his proposal would be a temporary fix. Ms. Schorr observed then that the JPA, if we were to get the fuel tax authority, would give us the opportunity to phase this out and look at the new revenue sources that are successful after getting legislation at the State level.

Mr. Svoboda stated that he thought we currently have the authority to impose an occupation tax on fuel. Mr. Hudkins commented that the City does, but the County does not under current legislation. Under the JPA, that authority could be extended.

Mr. Marvin thought the one cent property tax for City residents would again create an inequity and proposed splitting of the difference half-half. Ms. Newman asked what the County's limit is right now. Mr. Workman responded that their lid limit is 30 cents and last year they were at 28 or 29 cents. Ms. Newman noted that they still have a penny to go. [Laughter]

Mr. Hudkins stated that half-half would be what is being proposed. We're just looking at the means right now. The initial proposal to the Mayor had been half property tax from the County and half property tax from the City. If you think you've reached capacity on wheel tax, this would be the way to go. The stipulation would be if the fuel tax is initiated, we could get rid of that half percent property tax increase.

Discussion continued. Final direction to Staff from the Common members was that the taxing authority should remain with the individual bodies rather than having it rest with the JPA. It was agreed to have each body draw up a proposal to submit to the other as starting points for discussion.

Mayor Seng asked if the proposal before them today would be the format that would be used - with the included stipulation, as noted here today, that the two bodies wish to have it returned to them for approval...so is this what would be forwarded to both bodies? Mr. Rupp answered that both bodies would have a copy of the JPA Agreement as it is written now. Once we get the feed-back as to what final decisions are made, then we can amend the Agreement.

Recapping, Mr. Figard indicated that Staff needed direction from the two bodies as to what the funding sources will be. Then, we will write the JPA to very specifically state that. The Joint document would then be approved by both bodies. The funding authority would then rest with the two bodies. The JPA Board would only implement that....everything would be clearly documented and outlined in the Agreement.

COMP PLAN ANNUAL REVIEW & THE COMP PLAN LRTP - Mr. Marvin Krout came forward and made the presentation, outlining two issues he would discuss today. The First is the Comprehensive Plan Annual Review. The Planning Commission has held their hearings and made recommendations on all of the items that are a part of that Annual Review. The Summary Page [Attachment "A"] shows what their recommendations are. Mr. Krout reviewed the attached list.

05003: Trails Network Plan - Updating to identify and include stretches of trail that have been constructed - Approved unanimously

05004: County Future Road Improvements - Intended as a by-pass for 68th Street while it is closed down as the result of the imminent railroad over-pass construction. - Approved unanimously

05005 - Fletcher Avenue 14th to 27th Streets - This item had a great deal of public input at the Planning Commission hearing. Projections show 20,000+ cars per day there. The development in that area began with the dedication of 120 feet for a four+ lane roadway. The design by Public Works has been contracted and is imminent. The application came from neighborhood representatives who are concerned with having that much traffic through their neighborhood. Their thought was if the roadway were reduced from a 4+1 to a 2+1 there would be less traffic going through the neighborhood. This was submitted in spite of the platting which showed an arterial street with stacking and commercial zoning along a portion with open space as a buffer. People who move into the area consider themselves, whether they're on one side or the other, to be in one neighborhood, so they see this as an intrusion into the neighborhood.

One of the concerns of staff is if it is down-graded and it successfully limits the traffic on this street, then there is a likelihood of moving the traffic to Folkways which is an east-west collector street that runs through that neighborhood, which would be more of an intrusion into the future neighborhood than Fletcher which has been planned and programmed for widening. The Planning Commission recommended Denial of that proposed amendment by a 5-1 vote. The Planning Commission had wanted the developers to work with the City on public design process where there will be opportunities to work on the details of the design of the road. It is not in the Six-Year CIP, though it could be triggered by the commercial development on 14th Street. At that time, we would probably want to build the 4 lane section because of the increase in traffic. Other, non-traffic related issues, are being worked on by neighbors and the developer.

05007 - NW 70th & West Superior - This began as a half-mile section, but in order to serve it, the whole mile section would be needed. This is probably one of the potential locations for a school site in the northwest area, along with several others. The applicant is asking to move this from Priority B to Priority A. Mr. Krout explained that there is sewer that is immediately available to this site....the problem is that there are road paving issues and water issues that relate to this site. Public Works feels that they are fully programmed; have big challenges and some rate increases ahead in order to construct the system that is already expected. We didn't feel this is the time to be moving priorities just because the funding is not there to be funding additional infrastructure at this location.

The Planning Commission did agree unanimously that as we go into the next topic, which is updating the Comprehensive Plan, there may be opportunities to be looking at sites like this in terms of potential for infrastructure and more large scale modifications and expansions that may be appropriate as part of that update. But we did not feel it would be appropriate for this Annual Review process.

05008 - Southwest Area - This is a different sewer basin from the 70th & Warlick interchange that had been looked at in comparison. This location presents a whole new set of infrastructure issues, so we felt it would be premature to be making this request; the request was withdrawn by the applicant before the Planning Commission hearing.

05009 - North 56th & I-80 Industrial - The Planning Staff and the Chamber and others felt this area had a real potential to be served earlier than previously designated. It's Tier 2 - The request is for Tier 1 Priority A. It is one of the few interchanges that we have and is an area that has a great potential for Interchange-related Commercial and Employment uses. In I-3 for example, we allow for up to 50% Retail and Office use with the other to be a more Industrial oriented use. We were in favor of the Employment Designation for Tier 1, but not the Regional-Commercial designation that implies another South Pointe or another Gateway. We have a lot of Commercial down the road on North 27th Street that is designated for Regional-Commercial; our real need is for Employment uses, but the problem with Employment uses is if you want to maintain large parcels, sometimes it takes awhile to hold those parcels until the right business comes along. It may take some sort of private or public/private effort to hold land longer than the private market would hold it otherwise. We believe the Sewer, Water and Road issues all can be worked on and further researched. But, because it is a unique piece of land which is well buffered by I-80 and the Landfill from Residential uses, which is what many employers like - the recommendation was to Approve the Industrial designation and Tier 1-Priority A designation.

05011 - N. 48th & Havelock - The Ag Society agreed and the Planning Commission approved a 90 day deferral on that request, so it will be coming forward to the Planning Commission on August 17th. From the Ag Society's point of view, they have Floodplain issues and Transportation issues that they want to further discuss with the Public Works Department. Staff agrees that those issues need to be further discussed, but there is also the larger issue of Event Facilities in this community and how best to plan for them.

Mr. Workman asked about the Industrial zoning on the Northwest corner of 56th & I-80, noting that there has been a proposal in the community to rejuvenate the old Arrow Airport at Helen Boosalis Park. This is an airport that was in operation when Charles Lindbergh was in Lincoln. This is proposed not only from the standpoint for providing space for light aircraft, but also as an economic ploy. He assumed that the Industrial zoning on that Northwest corner would fit quite nicely with that proposal. Mr. Krout agreed that it would and noted that it would not be a difficulty. He added that more of a difficulty would be the residential development that is being proposed on the south side of I-80. [Upon request, Mr. Krout briefly explained that proposed 400 unit development to the Common members]

Discussion continued on the airstrip. Mr. Workman noted that this was south of the development Mr. Krout had just explained. It was noted that the area was in a floodplain area. Mr. Krout said he would get more information on that subdivision and get a map to the Council and County Board for further review.

Mr. Marvin asked if it were true that LPS might have land which they may have given to them at the N.W. 70th and West Superior location? Mr. Krout stated that he was not sure that a flat-out offer had been made, but there has been some discussion about that. Mr. Marvin asked how that would change the calculation as to whether the area would be moved from B to A priority? Mr. Krout answered that the way the calculus would be changed would be that free land would save the school board an additional \$800,000-to-\$1,000,000 and it would cost the City another percent or two in the rate increase if you were going to expand the water and road program to suddenly open up that area that hadn't been planned for opening.

Mr. Cook asked about the notice of the June 20th Joint Public Hearing of the Annual Review. He noted that in the past there has been a vote at that time by the two bodies on whether to approve the items. What is your plan at this point?

Mr. Krout responded that normally, that is the case, unless there is something controversial on it, we would vote on these items.

Ms. Eschliman asked regarding the 65th & I-80 Industrial Project - changing that to a more Industrial type designation, does that still allow something like restaurants and motels? Mr. Krout stated that it did. He would favor travel oriented retail-restaurant type uses, noting that Planning would support that. The I-3 District, which is the district that is likely to support this type of use, allows 30% Retail/Restaurant type uses. That would be, in a 200 acre track, 60 acres of Retail/Restaurant. Probably the corner and the 56th Street frontage would be retail uses.

Ms. Schorr asked about the North 84th & Havelock area. She noted that the Mayor has appointed a committee to look at the different facilities in this community and try to come to some consensus, which could be a lengthy process. In their request to have the corner changed to semi-public and put in a small motel/restaurant - just to support their existing facility that they have there and their current operation....how would holding that up be in anyway tied to coming to a consensus with some type of a downtown, larger urban center.

Mr. Krout answered that it would be a Commercial District that they would need in order to develop that - so that's what they're asking for. The bottom line is no one knows for sure how that money would be used - the profits from the lease or sale of that land. Until that issue was resolved, he thought, from the staff standpoint, it would be premature to go forward.

Mr. Heier asked why it was important to the Planning Department to know how that money is going to be spent? Mr. Krout responded that because if it's spent to support a new arena, which in the consensus of the community process outlined by the Mayor, would be in conflict with where and how we locate event centers, and that would be a concern. Mr. Heier asked if they wouldn't have to bring a proposal to the Planning Department to make an addition? Mr. Krout answered no - just as they didn't have to bring a proposal to our Department to do their original development. It's a fee, it's a public use, the AG Society, as a public entity is exempt from zoning, so it's only the Commercial that has to be zoned. But they could build whatever they want. They may not get a traffic light from the Public Works Department that they'd like, but they would be able to build anything that they'd like, if they had the funds.

Mr. Heier thought they could do that whether they sold Commercial or not -even if they didn't sell the property - they could still build whatever they want.. Mr. Krout answered that he was surmizing that they have all kinds of funding issues. And the County probably knows better than Mr. Krout what those would be and maybe they would have to come to the County Commissioners .

Mr. Heier asked if they came to Planning and stated that they wanted to sell that Commercial corner and would pay off their bonds with that....would Mr. Krout allow that? Mr. Krout answered that if that was put in writing and that was the clear purpose of it, Planning would probably look at it a little differently than we are now. Ms. Schorr asked if it would make enough difference to have it taken off pending and give it a go ahead? Mr. Krout stated that he thought Planning would be glad to sit down and review the issues.

Mr. Hudkins questioned Mr. Krout regarding 70th & West Superior, asking if the University had come before the Planning Commission to renew their request? The answer was that they had not, with Mr. Hudkins responding that it was a shame that the Planning Commission hadn't heard their plea. They have 300 people a day sometimes using the strength center and they really do need a road into that facility, either on Superior or N.W. 70th. Right now it isn't even a gravel road - just dirt. The other thing is that the investment in the Sewer infrastructure into that facility has been in place for nearly 30 years and everybody sees the water tower and are a little leery of buying the argument that it isn't serviceable with water.

Mr. Krout noted that one of the biggest problems with it is location. If they owned the western half-section instead of the eastern half-section along N.W. 56th Street, this would be fairly easy to talk about; but the problem is that when you get to the western section, Public Works believes that you have to loop the water system because of the pressure situation and that would be three miles of water line, plus the roads. Mr. Krout

hoped that as we get into the Comp Plan update process that we'll find some solutions to allow us to open up an area there. Mr. Hudkins noted they would appreciate whatever can be done to rectify the situation, noting that the NRD is a player in the scenario as well.

Mr. Krout briefly summarized the Comp Plan Update. This is an update of the Plan that was approved in June of 2002. We're mandated by the Federal Government to update in a major way every five years, with the Transportation Plan being an element of the Plan. The Federal Government's interest is with the Transportation element. They need to see that we've gone through a community process and update the Plan every five years which will include new traffic models that look out to the year 2030 instead of 2025. It means looking at how the community is going to expand and where the priority A & B areas are located. If we expand at about one square mile or more per year, then those maps with the priority lines will change as we grow. We're also required by the Statutes to have an up-to-date Comprehensive Plan in order to keep our zoning and sub-division ordinances alive.

Mr. Krout noted that it may seem to some of you that it was just not long ago that the Plan was adopted...but it takes about 18 months to do the work to provide an adoptable Plan in December of '06 in order to stay in compliance with Federal government requirements. We're looking at a 10 year cycle where major updates would be made and looking at this as a minor update in terms of the issues. We don't believe that much has changed that we would have to re-examine every one of the dozens and dozens of goals and strategies in the Plan. He thought there were a lot of things that could be held constant, such as the growth rate and certain other assumptions and goals that were made in the last Comp Plan. What we need to do, mostly, is look forward another five years and update the longer range plans for infrastructure and figure where we're going to be once some bond programs are paid off, when we have built Antelope Valley (finally) - will we have more capacity? Those are the issues we will address as we look out into the future of the Plan.

That is our intent and as part of thinking of this as a minor update, we've talked of the Planning Commission as being the developer of the Plan and are not planning to have a separate Comp Plan Committee which would make recommendations to the Planning Commission to be forwarded to the governing bodies. We will short-cut that process a little by getting the Planning Commission more involved in this process from the beginning. This also gets the Planning Commission out as the "eyes & ears" for the community, so all of the work doesn't seem to be so Staff-generated.

Mr. Krout noted that Mr. Figard spoke briefly on the nexus between land use and transportation, but basically, we'll be revisiting the infrastructure gap and see how we can close it. There are always issues with the smaller outlying communities that need to be addressed and we'll be working with them on their plans. We'll be talking about financing mechanisms as part of the infrastructure gap - and what might make sense for Lincoln and what can help us get to where we need to be. As we invite people to discuss the plan with community input, we'll bring their views to you for further exploration.

The first issue that will be brought before the Planning Commission will be defining the land use assumptions for how and where Lincoln will grow. Then we will develop three different land use scenarios about the direction of growth, how much land will be needed, whether we will grow at a greater or at the same density. We'll ask the Planning Commission to look at those and try to develop one scenario which might be a hybrid of those three that might seem to be a general direction of growth. Then, in November, we'll take that to another level of detail - especially with regards to transportation.

Mr. Figard announced that for the Federal Highway Administration to affirm the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan, while we're not doing a major re-do of the Comprehensive Plan, we must have a public discussion and either affirm change, or re-affirm the strategies and goals that go into transportation planning and land use. We're not proposing a lot of change, but there needs to be a public discussion.

The second comment Mr. Figard made was in regard to the difficulty of transportation planning in the Lincoln/Lancaster community. He was excited about using the Planning Commission as the public vehicle for open houses and the gathering of input. As the Plan comes to them for their recommendations to you, they will have participated in that public process. They will have heard, first-hand what the community is saying. It will take some extra time and effort on their part and Mr. Figard was glad that they were willing to do that.

Mr. Figard stated that we can not separate land use and transportation. As we go through this process, if we discuss "land use", we'll try to explain what the best transportation system to serve it might be. If we change the land use, it changes the transportation service; change transportation, it would effect the land use. Mobility is one of the most essential ingredients that we've got in our community's quality of life. He implored the Common members to please remember that you can't change one piece of the plan without the other.

Mr. Kent Morgan briefly outlined the attached schedule: [Attachment "B"]

CARDWELL BRANCH UPDATE & OTHER FLOODPLAIN MAPPING ACTIVITIES: Ms. Nicole Fleck-Tooze, Public Works, came forward and made the presentation which outlined the attached Floodplain Mapping Update. [Attachment "C"] Rick Wilson, Chief of the Hydrologic Studies Section of the USDS and Glen Johnson, General Manager for the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District were also part of the presentation. Ms. Fleck-Tooze noted that there were other staff members who would be available to answer questions at the end of the presentation.

The main focus of the presentation is the Cardwell Branch Floodplain mapping, but also included is a brief over-view of where the Department is on other floodplain mapping activities as well. We'll close with a quick video simulation on the Salt Creek Floodplain.

Floodplain Mapping. The City, as a FEMA Cooperating Technical Partner, undertook the mapping update for five Streams - Beals Slough, SE Upper Salt Creek, Stevens Creek, Cardwell Branch and Salt Creek. As part of this mapping update, we've coordinated these updates with the Watershed Master Plans which are being worked on jointly by the City and the NRD.

Mayor's Floodplain Task Force: These recommendations are consistent with the Mayor's Floodplain Task Force recommendations which advocated taking a comprehensive watershed approach to floodplain mapping; recognizing the community interest and responsibility for prevention of future flood damages; making accurate floodplain mapping a priority and utilizing the latest technology and data available.

Cardwell Branch: One important consideration is the Future Urban Growth that is shown in the community's Comprehensive Plan. In Tier 1 there are 2.5 square miles; in Tier 2 there are about 5 square miles downstream of Yankee Hill Lake; the rest of the watershed is in Tier 3 (approximately 9 square miles).

Mr. Rick Wilson, with US Geological Survey, representing that Federal Agency which Congress has charged with studying the water resources within the United States, continued the presentation. He noted that, because of that charge, we entered into a cooperative water program with the City of Lincoln and also with the NRD of the Lower Platte South.

Why we want to update the Floodplain mapping is that the old study, done in the 1980s at which time Cardwell Branch was a small rural watershed within the Salt Creek System, had the majority of the more detailed work in the study done on Salt Creek and not on Cardwell Branch. Our current study has a much more detailed analysis of the Cardwell Branch. Since the early 80's, data and technology have become more accurate and comprehensive techniques are more representative and standardized, as we follow nationally-consistent Federal standards for floodplain mapping.

Data Collection Efforts: Stream-channel surveying was done, which means using GPS and traditional survey methods, surveying almost 150 cross-sections within this study reach. The entire study area was about seven miles in length for the Cardwell Branch and five miles on an un-named tributary which gave us a 12 mile study area. The average spacing between the cross-sections was about 500 feet. Cross-sectioning calculations in our modeling effort gives us a very robust and accurate data study on which to conduct this study.

The “hydrology” strategy: The basic components of the study, after data collection, include a certain rainfall event (we call it the 100 year storm); in real terms it equates to the one-percent chance occurrence. What that would mean, in any given year, you would have a one-percent chance of receiving a rainfall event of 6.68 inches within a 24 hour period. That is the “100 Year Storm”, and that was the foundation of our study to model the effect of that rainfall and the area that it would flood. We used extensive Geographic Information System coverages on soil types, land use, vegetation, obstructions in the floodplain, etc. We used the best available data and it was extensive.

The Hydraulic Analysis: We know the rainfall event from this 6.68 inch rainfall, then we determine how much discharge water is going down the channel. This is critical information, because when we route that floodway down the channel, we want to know the elevation, how deep the water is getting, how far it spreads outside of the banks of the stream. The rainfall event that was received in the watershed of May of '04 was about 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 inches. We call that the 2-Year Storm. In the Hallam area, they got between four and six inches...that was a significant event.

The modeling program used on the Hydrology was a standard FEMA documented program, accepted and developed by the Corp of Engineers called Tech HMS. For the Hydraulics, we used another standard, FEMA approved program developed by Corp of Engineers. Those were the two computer models into which we incorporated our data.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the floodplain areas, noting that the beginning of the study had been immediately upstream of Highway 77 and the railroad bridge; the Cardwell Branch then proceeds to the west; gets to a specific confluence where Cardwell continues to the west and runs to the Southwest to Yankee Hill Reservoir. At that confluence is the unnamed tributary which then proceeds south. The entire outline shows the watershed boundaries. He noted that there were detailed maps that could be passed out to the Common members. He did note that the current study was superimposed on the 1980's study to try to demonstrate the difference in what was done and the difference in the results of the study.

The Preliminary Results from the Hydraulic Study: The depth of the water and the impact that has been calculated in the older study is about 12 feet; the current study calculated about 12-1/2 or 12.6 feet. So, there was a net rise in the new study of .6 feet. Downstream from the confluence of the unnamed tributary and Cardwell Branch there is a depth of water a little over 13 feet. The new study calculation shows about 14.2 feet. That is a net-rise from the old study to the new study of about .8 feet. Upstream of this confluence between the dam and Cardwell Woods Subdivision, the old study showed a depth of a little over 8 feet; the new study calculates almost 9 feet. So, the average for all 150 cross-sections over the entire floodplain show an average net-rise of .8 feet from the old study to the new study.

What we've determined is that eight new houses will go into the 100 Year Floodplain; three houses would leave it. That is the results of that study and the floodplain boundary.

Time Lines: The study was begun with the City of Lincoln and the NRD in August of '03; November of '04, the first public meeting was held with the Cardwell Woods Homeowners Association and other interested parties. We presented the preliminary study results and discussed that with the public. There was another smaller meeting with the Homeowners Association in December where we reviewed the study results again and presented that to them and answered more detailed questions. From December of '04 through March of '05, we made revisions to the study and completed an analysis that we call the Flow-way. We held another public meeting with the City and the NRD on March 24, 2005. That second meeting offered even more finalized results. We still did not release the study formally. Then we had a targeted, very specific

meeting with a couple of the land owners in the Cardwell Woods subdivision at their home on May 9th - at the Halstead home, trying to explain what we've calculated and determined.

Next Steps: As part of USGS, quality is a paramount issue. We are now undergoing a detailed review, which means we have the study as completed; we've sent that to experts in Kansas and in Ohio. Then after these two reviews are received, it will be reviewed by the Regional Office in Denver while, concurrently, the folks in the City of Lincoln and the NRD are doing a review. When we talk about a review, it covers the Hydrology and Hydraulics, our Data Collection techniques - it's the whole shot. Once that review is done, which should be accomplished in a couple of weeks, then we will finalize the product, the maps, the studies, and we will make all of it available to the public. We will have another public meeting in early July and at that time we will present the results and folks can review it thoroughly. After that occurs, the Common members will have a certain public review time-frame, with the intent of submitting it to FEMA, the true regulatory agency for this type of work with the Flood Insurance Program - in late September.

Mr. Glen Johnson with the Lower Platte South Natural Resources District, highlighted where in the process the studies were on the other mapping efforts within the community:

Stevens Creek - Floodplain mapping was concurrent with the master planning; the "best information" flood-prone/floodplain was locally adopted in December, 2004. That study is now being used as the "best information" for floodplain administration. Since that time, or since the aerial photography and topographic mapping was done for that study, we've gotten information on specific parcels of property where there had been changes in elevation. We're incorporating that into the current information before the final product goes to FEMA.

On Beals Slough and South East Upper Salt Basins, as part of the Comprehensive Basin Master Plan, that identified the floodplain, flood-prone areas, both plans have been adopted. The one thing that wasn't done at that time was to identify within the flood-prone/floodplain areas, what the floodway and the flood fringe is. That is the process going on now. Once those are identified, those two studies will also be submitted to FEMA.

On Salt Creek, the newest project is the Salt Creek Floodplain Mapping Update. This goes back to the 1970's Corp of Engineers' Study that was done for FEMA. The new study covers an area beginning south of Saltillo and runs all the way to Stevens Creek, northeast of Lincoln. The consulting firms have been engaged in this. We've had the first open house meeting at the end of March this year. They're continuing to work on the hydrology and the hydraulics. This fall we'll have the draft maps prepared, then hold a second open house to review those maps. In the interim, we'll have a speakers bureau set up to make this presentation to any and all kinds of groups and organizations that are interested.

One of the other things we had developed as part of the public information on this process, to help people understand a little better, is this simulation on the floodplain of Salt Creek. It is a fly-over Salt Creek from Wilderness Park north and east all the way to Superior Street. What this shows is a representation of what happens in a major storm event as the Salt Creek channel fills with flow. The Salt Creek levies do not contain the Hundred Year Flood. At some point greater than the 35-Year or 50-Year Flood, the flow starts to spill over the top of the levies and begins to fill in the floodplain. [Here the video was run]

Mr. Cook asked if the video were available on-line. Ms. Fleck-Tooze noted that it is. The entire presentation is available on-line under video on demand (CIC's Channel 5 webpage). Channel 5 is also showing the presentation. [At <http://www.lincoln.ne.gov/city/mayor/cic/5citytv/video.htm> choose "Salt Creek Floodplain Mapping Update" under "Public Service Announcements"] Mr. Cook asked about a 50-55 year simulation, noting that there would not be a significant difference between this 100 year simulation and a 200-500 year storm simulation. It was noted that up to a 50 year event the levies do normally contain the flow.

There was a brief discussion of 100 year storm facts covering the Salt Creek Basin.

Mr. Hudkins asked about the Cardwell Branch study and wondered what protections we have for those property owners - or what remedies for those who build in there who used the "best buildable" information they had - and now, through this mapping process - it's come into question. What alternatives will they have and what can we do to help?

Ms. Fleck-Tooze answered that one of the things was a follow-up step after the floodplain mapping, which was done in conjunction with a sort-of First Phase of our Watershed Master Planning. One of the things we've identified as a follow-up over the next couple of years is to do a more detailed Watershed Master Plan - similar to what we've done for other Watersheds. That would be the time when we can look for solutions that could help in that area. We're now in the process of technical review during June and there will be a very careful review that will make sure that we're certain of what is being proposed for the new mapping. Ms. Fleck-Tooze stated that they would be open to looking at a number of different alternatives as we look at our Watershed Master Plan.

KENO INTERLOCAL UPDATE Ms. Kit Boesch came forward to make her presentation on the Keno Interlocal Update. Ms. Boesch stated that she had been before the Common a few months ago with this interlocal agreement, but since that much time has passed and since we have new Council Members, Ms. Boesch thought, in order to make sure everyone was happy, she would bring the agreement back to the table and just reaffirm some of the things the Common members had discussed earlier.

First, there has never been an interlocal agreement, so what this is, basically, is a formalization of a process we've been actually doing for about eleven years. For those eleven years, "informally" has been handling it very well. But, now we start talking about a lot of money - nearly half-a-million to a million dollars- so having a formal process is really a good idea.

Ms. Boesch noted that the Mayor recommended that the six positions on the Human Services Prevention Fund be actually approved by the City Council and the County Board. Ms. Boesch thought that was an excellent idea. The other two positions, one being appointed by the City Council and the other by the County Board; and Ms. Boesch will be looking for the recommendations from these two bodies as terms come up. She noted that Ms. McRoy is serving on the Board now, Ms. Boesch is serving, Ray has served on the Board and the Mayor has served. We've had a variety of people representing elected officials. In addition, there have been six community folks. Basically, Ms. Boesch looks for people who know prevention and ask them if they'll serve and they agree and we move forward. But, it needs to be a little more formal process. She has no problem turning those peoples names over to the Common and having the two bodies approve them....or having Common members make recommendations.

The other change is that the reserve account becomes a formal endowment. Right now, as of September, we will see that endowment turn around a half million dollars. It has taken eleven years to get there. We've been distributing the money at a rate of 60% of the funds being disbursed and allocated to agencies and 40% being put into the reserve account. We're recommending in the interlocal agreement that it become a formal endowment. Per our last discussion, that endowment would not be touched until it reached one million dollars, at which point the Advisory Board would talk to the JBC with some recommendations. Those recommendations would be brought back to each of the two bodies as to how to deal with that money.

The third change is what you allocate and what you save. We are now allocating 60% and would endow 40%. The recommendation at the end of that last meeting when this was discussed was that 65% would be allocated with 35% being endowed each year. Another suggestion during that discussion was 70%/30%. Obviously the more that is given away now, the smaller and slower the growth of the endowment. It may take eleven years to reach one million dollars. Ms. Boesch had no recommendation as to what the Common would/should decide, but simply needed some direction in order to move on with the agreement.

Ms. Newman asked if everyone was happy with 60/40? Mr. Hudkins moved to have the Common recommend to the respective bodies that the split be made at 60/40. Mr. Svoboda seconded the motion. Discussion ensued with the motion carrying unanimously to continue with the 60/40 split.

Ms. Boesch confirmed that she would have a final copy of the Interlocal Agreement to each body for signatures and then, we'll move forward. This will go into effect in the December round of distributions. The June/July distribution will remain under the old agreement; the new agreement will take force in December.

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - Mr. Svoboda stated that, as the County and City meet quarterly with the School Board, there is one other elected body that we have never met with and that is the Airport Authority. He asked if there was a need to meet with the Airport Authority to discuss the same things we discuss with the LPS - perhaps not on a quarterly basis, but at least one time to discuss issues of concern.

Mayor Seng stated that she had been thinking about that, too. There has been discussion of an airfield and she felt the Airport Authority would have some comments on that. She felt we should have a meeting with them on that issue. Ms. Newman added that, when discussing economic development, all of that land should be included in such a discussion.

Mr. Hudkins felt that this is a timely concern. He noted that he had held discussions with some members of the Airport Authority and they're talking about putting in a shuttle service between Lincoln and Kansas City to access that market.

After further discussion, it was determined that the two bodies and the Airport Authority would meet one time to see what issues could be addressed. It was agreed to hold the meeting August 1st with the Airport Authority as a presenter to the Common.

ADJOURNMENT - Larry Hudkins moved adjournment. The motion was seconded by several Common members and carried by unanimous consensus of those Common members present. The Common meeting adjourned at approximately 10:40 a.m.

Submitted by
Joan V. Ray, Council Secretary
commonminutes060605

2005 Comprehensive Plan Annual Review

Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Planning Commission Action of May 18, 2005

Number	Application	Planning Commission Recommendation
05003	Trails Network Plan by Parks and Recreation to relocate the Dead Man's Run trail from N. 33 rd to N. 48 th to the south side of Leighton, rather than through UNL East Campus and update map to reflect newly built trails.	Approval 6-0
05004	County Future Road Improvements by County Board to designate S. 82 nd Street from Hickman Road to Panama Road as "Potential Paving" and update road map.	Approval 6-0
05005	Fletcher Ave, 14th to 27th by Annette McRoy for the North Hills Neighborhood to change Fletcher Avenue from 4+1 lanes to 2+1 lanes and functional classification from Minor Arterial to Urban Collector.	Denial 5-1
05007	NW 70th & West Superior , by J. Michael Rierden for Lincoln Federal Savings for a change from Priority B to A.	Denial 6-0
05008	Southwest Area , by Robert Watson for various property owners for a change from Priority B to A and site specific designation of Community Center	Withdrawn by applicant
05009	N. 56th & I-80 Industrial : by Mark Hunzeker for change from Agricultural to Industrial and "Regional" Commercial, inclusion in 2025 Future Service Limit and change from Tier II to Tier I, Priority A on northwest corner of interchange.	Approval 6-0 of staff recommendation of modified Tier I boundary on ridge line and industrial designation at this time
05011	N. 84th and Havelock by Lancaster County Agricultural Society for change from Public and Semi-Public to Commercial on southeast corner.	At applicant's request public hearing continued to August 17, 2005

Note: On May 18th, Pearson and Taylor absent and new Commission member not yet approved.

Joint concurrent public hearing of City Council and County Board scheduled for **Monday, June 20th at 4:00 p.m.** on the Annual Review.

Comprehensive Plan and Long Range Transportation Plan Update

DRAFT - May 27, 2005

DRAFT Schedule:

Task Descriptions	2005								2006											
	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
1 - Process & Assumption Validation																				
2 - Develop 3 Future Service Scenarios																				
3 - Adopt Future Service Limit & Land Use Plan																				
4 - Plan Elements and Transportation Plan Evaluation																				
5 - Plan Review and Planning Commission Adoption																				
6 - Final City Council & County Board Adoption																				

■ Phase I - Planning Process & Assumptions Validation

(May - June 2005)

1. Begin monthly meetings with staff from various agencies (May 12th)
2. Brief **Planning Commission** on update process/ schedule (May 25th noon)
3. Brief **City-County Common** on process/schedule (June 6th 8:30 am)
4. Validate planning and land use assumptions with **Planning Commission** (June 22nd, 11:00 am)
5. Begin public information activities (i.e., website, newsletter, etc.)

■ Phase II - Develop 3 Future Service Limit Scenarios

(July - August 2005)

1. **Request proposals** from public for land use changes and/or expansion of Future Service Limit (FSL) – deadline July 1st
2. **Develop FSL scenario information** for purposes of comparison; draft scenarios to be developed Planning Dept. with city and county agencies (done by July 15th)
3. Obtain **Planning Commission** acceptance of 3 FSL scenarios for purposes of study (July 20th working meeting at 10 a.m.)
4. Brief **City-County Common** on 3 FSL scenarios (August 1st)
5. Brief **other incorporated communities** on process and issues (July - Aug)
6. Route 3 FSL scenarios and land use data by traffic zone to other departments for review & comment including traffic analysis of scenarios (Aug)
7. **Issue report** on analysis of 3 FSL scenarios (by Aug 31st)

■ Phase III - Working Future Service Limit & Land Use Plan

(Sept. - Oct. 2005)

1. Conduct **public information activities** (i.e., open house, website, etc.) on results of analysis of 3 FSL (September)
2. Review FSL analysis with **Planning Comm.** (September 14th at 11 a.m.)
3. **Planning Comm. Public Hearing** and give direction on single FSL (Sept 28th)
4. **Super Common** (Planning Commission, Mayor, City Council and County Board) on Planning Comm. direction on FSL (Oct 3rd)
5. Develop **staff report on land use proposals** and proposed general land use map for study purposes (Oct)
6. **Planning Comm. Public Hearing** and give direction on "working" land use map (Oct 26th)
7. **Super Common** on Planning Comm. direction on land use (Nov 1st)

■ **Phase IV - Plan Elements and Transportation Plan Evaluation**

(Nov 2005 - May 2006)

1. Prepare land use data by traffic zone by **Planning Dept.** (November)
2. Brief **Planning Comm.** On transportation issues (Nov 23rd at 11:00 am)
3. **Request proposals** from public of any text changes to plan (deadline Jan 1st, 2006)
4. Planning staff work on elements of the Plan, except transportation (Dec.)
5. **Mobility analysis** of land use plan by a subcommittee of the **MPO Technical Committee** (Dec 2005)
6. **MPO Tech. Committee** review session on mobility analysis (Jan 2006)
7. **Public information activities** on public's views on mobility needs (Jan - Feb.)
8. Review other elements of the Plan with **Planning Comm.** (Jan. - Feb.)
9. Develop transportation improvement alternatives (Jan - Feb)
10. **MPO Tech. Committee** review session on alternatives (Feb.)
11. Work with **Planning Commission** to narrow transportation alternatives for public review & discussion (March)
12. **Super Common** discussion on transportation alternatives (April)
13. Conduct **public information activities** on draft transportation alternatives—meetings with various groups in addition to regular activities (April)
14. Conduct **Planning Commission** Public Hearing(s) – give direction to staff on transportation elements, including trails, transit, roads, etc. (May)
15. **Super Common** on Planning Comm. direction on transportation elements (June)
16. **MPO Tech. Committee** on Planning Comm. direction (June)

■ **Phase V - Updated Plan Review and PC Public Hearing**

(June - Sept. 2006)

1. Staff develops all remaining text/ map amendments to update Plan (June)
2. Hold **MPO Technical Committee** review session on draft Plan (July)
3. Review complete draft Plan with **Planning Commission** & action on draft (working meetings in July)
4. Undertake public information activities on draft plan (July)
5. Conduct **Planning Commission** public hearing(s) on draft Plan (Aug -Sept)
6. Adoption of recommended Plan by **Planning Commission** (Sept)

■ **Phase VI - Final Plan Adoption and Public Hearing**

(Oct. - Dec. 2006)

1. Brief **City-County Common** on PC Draft Plan (early Oct)
2. Conduct **Joint City Council-County Board** public hearing on draft Plan (Oct.)
3. Adoption of final Comp Plan (incl. LRTP) by **Council and Board** (Oct./Nov.)
4. Adoption of final LRPT by **MPO Officials Committee** (Nov./Dec.)



Salt Creek Floodplain Mapping Update

Project Overview



The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is undertaking a comprehensive, multi-year initiative to update aging flood hazard maps for communities across the country. As part of this Federal program, FEMA is partnering with the City of Lincoln in cooperation with the Lower Platte South NRD to develop more accurate floodplain information for various streams and channels within the City and its future growth areas, including Salt Creek.

The current FEMA floodplain for Salt Creek is outdated, having been initially developed by the Corps of Engineers in the late 1970's. This was recognized by the Mayor's Floodplain Task Force, which recommended a new, comprehensive floodplain study and FEMA floodplain mapping effort for Salt Creek. The Salt Creek mapping update will produce revised FEMA floodplain maps for Salt Creek using the latest technology and data available to accurately reflect Salt Creek's floodplain. This information will assist in efforts to protect homes and businesses from flood hazards and provide guidance for future development adjacent to the channel.

The mapping project is expected to take approximately one year and to be completed in early 2006. FEMA will then incorporate this information into a more comprehensive, updated digital floodplain map for the City of Lincoln. It is anticipated to take a year or more following the completion of the Salt Creek study for FEMA's formal process before the revised Salt Creek floodplain is reflected on the official FEMA floodplain maps.



The project will include the following major components:

- Updating the FEMA floodplain and floodway maps extending from approximately $\frac{1}{2}$ mile south of Saltillo Road to the confluence with Stevens Creek. (See figure on reverse side).
- Addressing the Salt Creek flood storage areas as they relate to the floodway boundary.
- A series of 3 open houses to provide information regarding the status of the study: 1) to describe the goals and objectives of the project; 2) to present and receive feedback on draft floodplain and floodway boundaries; and 3) to display the floodplain and floodway boundaries that incorporate FEMA review comments prior to adoption by the City of Lincoln.
- A visual presentation that communicates the goals and objectives of the project to be used at the open houses, and to be made available by the project team to various neighborhood associations, business groups, civic organizations, and other interest groups.
- Several interest group meetings to discuss the draft floodplain and floodway maps and answer questions from groups that share similar concerns.

For more information contact Milan Wall with the Heartland Center for Leadership Development at 474-7667 or visit 'lincoln.ne.gov', keyword 'watershed' on the web

Salt Creek Floodplain Mapping Update Project Boundary

Legend

-  Salt Creek Alignment
-  Existing FEMA Floodplain (Salt Creek, 1981)

